

**Lead Entity Advisory Group**  
**November 14, 2003**  
**SeaTac WA**  
**Summary Notes**

**LEAG**

**Attendance:**

Members:

Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board  
Shirley Solomon, Skagit Watershed Council, Chair  
John Sims, Quinault Nation LE  
Doug Osterman, King County WRIA 9, Vice Chair  
Paul Dorn, Kitsap County LE  
Scott Jungblom, Pend Oreille CD LE  
Steve Martin, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board

**Others**

**Present:**

Other Lead Entities:

Kristi Silver, King County WRIA 8  
Aaron Waller, Stillaguamish LE  
Martha Neumann, Snohomish LE  
Jeanette Dorner, Nisqually LE  
David Troutt, Nisqually LE  
Kim Bredensteiner, Island County LE  
Selinda Barkhuis, North Olympic Peninsula LE  
Amy Hatch-Winecka, Thurston, Mason LE

Staff:

Jim Fox, IAC/SRFB  
Rollie Geppert, IAC/SRFB  
Kristi Lynett, WDFW  
Brian Walsh, WDFW  
Keith Keown, WDFW

**LEAG**

**Members**

**Absent:**

Jay Watson, Hood Canal Coordinating Council, unexcused  
Judy Phelps, Chelan County Citizens Committee, excused

**Introductions**

Round table introductions. The group welcomed the newest LE Coordinator from North Olympic Peninsula, Selinda Barkuis.

**Approval of  
Sept Notes**

Approved, with Steve Martin officially excused from last meeting.

**Chair Report**

Reported on LEAG matters to the Issues Task Force at the October 16/17 meeting. Reported to the SRFB at the October 29/30 meeting. Received a request from Chair Ruckelshaus for LEAG to: 1) review IAC's new Family Forest Fish Blockage Program as a model for a LE block grant program(LEAG will discuss this at the next meeting); and 2) offer suggestions for acquisition policy language. Also received a request from the Issues Task Force Chair asking LEAG to set a priority on the issues

that the ITF will address at their November 18/19 meeting. Discussed with WDFW Lead Entity staff the expanding of the Lead Entity website to include information regarding LEAG members and lead entity coordinators. This is now underway. Recommends that LEAG's Policy and Procedures undergo revision and update. This task will commence early in the new year. In response to an e-mail from Keith Wolf (correctly) asserting that LEAG does not represent all lead entities, discussed ways of getting greater degree of input from the 17 not directly connected to LEAG. Asked if members were willing to take on the task of making contact with two of their colleagues before and after each LEAG meeting. This would help in the difficult process of sharing information and bringing a variety of perspectives to bear at LEAG meetings. LEAG members agreed and asked Kristi to circulate a sign up sheet.

## Staff Report

Press Release of SalmonScape will get info out to LEs on this WDFW product. LE office will try to get out to visit with LEs over the coming months. Regional Recovery Planning Guide public comment, will be getting final document out within the month, and then writing responsiveness summary.

## 5<sup>th</sup> Round Policies and Process

*The following notes are organized topically, i.e. grouped by the proposed flowchart boxes (pg 5 of the "Proposed Approach to 5<sup>th</sup> Round" document), and may not reflect the sequence of the actual discussion. Each comment listed below does not represent a consensus concern, only one that was expressed by at least one individual at the meeting. If a Response is noted, it is because WDFW or IAC staff was able to provide feedback immediately.*

### Box 1- Base Allocation

*Concern:* Potentially over 50% of allocation based on Fit to Focused Strategy. The guidance has come late and many LEs do not have the resources to significantly improve or revise their strategies.

*Concern:* How to prioritize when have no listed species or all are listed species? *Response:* prioritizing all stocks is prioritizing.

*Concern:* Sometimes it is more important to prioritize stocks, rather than species.

Concern: No agreement on what criteria should be included in determining the base allocation. Many present thought more appropriate layers as a surrogate for need should be incorporated. Those include nearshore, human population, recovery plans, past performance, miles of anadromous streams, habitat area, partnerships (e.g. multi-LE). Others weren't too concerned with the criteria used to determine the pre-allocation; to them what is most important is knowing a base level of funding is available. This information is important in keeping committees and sponsors engaged over the next 8 months.

Non-Puget Sound LEs tend to favor 50/50 split for pre-allocation/competitive score, while Puget Sound LEs tend to favor a higher percentage for project list fit to focused strategies.

*Concern:* If base allocation is high, it may imply to funders that the money is not necessarily going for high priority beneficial projects.

*Response:* The base allocation is not an automatic entitlement. LEs must have good quality projects to receive any funds.

#### Box 2- Review of Strategies

*Concern:* There is insufficient time for lead entities to respond to Review Panel comments because of when Round 5 commences. Once the Application process is underway it is not feasible to expect that lead entities will still be tweaking their strategies. The strategies need to be set when the round begins.

*Response:* The state is not expecting a wholesale change of strategies. The review is simply a chance for the Review Panel to better understand strategies and begin the dialogue with lead entities. *Concern:* Make sure that those expectations are very clear in the Review Panel's guidelines.

*Concern:* consistency of review from Federal TRT and Review Panel; some LEs won't have finished their "watershed chapters" and identified actions until June and the first review of strategies takes place in late winter. *Response:* Strategies will not be evaluated (and then just on their "focus and specificity") until July. The early review is optional and non-binding. It is setup to provide the collegial dialogue requested by many LEs.

#### Box 3- First Technical Review of Projects

*Concern:* If SRFB must have technical accountability, then get it early through peer-to-peer dialog.

*Concern:* Make Tech Advisors visits optional. *Response:* We will incorporate that recommendation into staff's proposal to SRFB.

#### Box 4- Lead Entities Evaluate Projects

Use of SRFB benefit and certainty definitions optional for LEs.

#### Box 5- Final Technical Review of Projects

*Concern:* Recommend that the Technical Advisory Teams does not see LE ranking

*Concern:* Establish a "fix-it" loop by scheduling into the process a two-week window for an exchange, either written or face-to-face, between sponsors and technical advisors to address any "red-flagged" projects.

*Response:* We will incorporate that recommendation into staff's proposal to SRFB.

#### Box 6- Review Panel Evaluates Lists

Snohomish uses 0-5 with their scores and found that it works better than

0 to 10.

*Concern:* state reviewing quality of strategies, suggest drop the first half of the sentences in the “fit to strategy” criteria. *Response:* The state is only reviewing the quality of the strategies as they relate to focus and specificity. If the wording of the criteria is unclear on this intent, suggestions for improvement would be appreciated.

*Concern:* General consensus to establish a final list/strategy “fix-it” loop by establishing a two week window for an exchange, either written or face-to-face, between LEs and the Review Panel to discuss the Review Panel’s written evaluation (Fit to Focused Strategy score).

*Response:* We will incorporate that recommendation into staff’s proposal to SRFB.

#### Box 7- SRFB Allocates Funds

*Concern:* What to do with “surplus” funds from a LE list?

*Concern:* Should LEs be required to follow their priority list? Or can there be some flexibility depending upon funding amount?

*Concern:* “Red Flag” projects should be allowed to be forwarded to the SRFB for consideration.

#### General Comments

*Concern:* How will estuaries and or nearshore projects fit in? *Response:* IAC is working with PSNERP to determine how to best handle these environments. Three scenarios are on the table: 1) Having Nearshore experts on Tech Advisory Team, or 2) maintain a separate Nearshore Team to pull out and review projects, they would also score and rank projects for PSNERP funding. 3) pull all nearshore projects out at beginning of SRFB process, and have separate funding for Nearshore projects. *Concern:* This approach needs to be clarified because will effect finalizations of strategies and LE and sponsor decisions. *Concern:* How will non Puget Sound estuaries be approached?

*Concern:* Need to recognize that some Lead Entities are far along on ESA Recovery, and that recovery plans/chapter submission is imminent. The state review of strategies approach may be redundant and superfluous.

*Response:* No recovery plans have been approved by the federal government and will not be by next summer. This could be an issue for the 6<sup>th</sup> Round and will need to be carefully discussed.

*Concern:* This process establishes a maximum amount that a LE could receive; but that maximum amount may not be able to fund the really important, but expensive recovery projects. *Response:* SRFB is responsible for recovery across the state, but doesn’t have enough funds to do so. It is important for LEs to broaden their funding options and not rely too heavily on the SRFB.

*Concern:* Caps plus maximum per LE could hurt some LEs who deal with expensive projects (as prioritized in their strategy). *Response:* Caps may

not be needed or justified under this process.

In closing, the Chair asked each person present for their perspective on the proposal. Overall, comments were favorable. Those present were impressed by the work of IAC and WDFW staff and appreciated the effort made to incorporate lead entity concerns. While the process may seem laborious and daunting, many steps are optional and in place to allow for early feed back and more local autonomy, to minimize surprises, and to create some funding certainty.

**NEXT MEETING: 10 a.m. February 4, 2004 in SeaTac, WA**